1 BEFORE THE POLLUTION CONTROL HEARINGS BOARD 2 STATE OF WASHINGTON 3 IN THE MATTER OF WEST WATERWAY LUMBER COMPANY, 4 PCHB No. 203 Appellant, 5 FINDINGS OF FACT, vs. 6 CONCLUSIONS AND ORDER STATE OF WASHINGTON, DEPARTMENT OF ECOLOGY, 8 Respondent. 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

This matter is the appeal of a \$500.00 civil penalty invoked under RCW 90.48.350 for an alleged oil spill violation. It came before two members of the Pollution Control Hearings Board (Judge Matthew W. Hill, presiding, and Walt Woodward) in the King County Courthouse, Seattle, at 9:30 a.m., November 30, 1972.

Appellant appeared through its attorney, Milton C. Smith, and respondent through Charles V. Lean, Assistant Attorney

General. Richard Reinertsen, Olympia court reporter, recorded the proceedings.

Witnesses were sworn and testified. Exhibits were offered and admitted. Counsel made closing arguments.

On the basis of testimony heard, exhibits examined and closing arguments by counsel, the Pollution Control Hearings Board prepared Proposed Findings of Fact, Conclusions and Order which were submitted to the appellant and respondent on January 23, 1973. Having considered the exceptions filed by the respondent and appellant to the Proposed Findings, Conclusions and Order, the Pollution Control Hearings Board adheres in substance to its proposed decision with certain changes and additions, and makes and enters the following:

FINDINGS OF FACT

Į.

The SIRIUS, a former Navy vessel purchased by appellant in April, 1971 for scrapping, was flooded with water during a fire in January, 1972 and capsized on its port side in West Vaterway, Seattle, King County, at its West Waterway Lumber Company moorage. Shortly after this incident, respondent advised appellant that it should have a standby boom to contain oil which might escape from the overturned hull.

II.

In the morning of June 26, 1972 from five to ten gallons

 26

FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS AND ORDER

of black oil escaped into West Waterway from an open hatch
near the stern of the SIRIUS. Appellant was contacted by
the United States Coast Guard relative to the oil and at
noon on that day employees of appellant began shoveling
an absorbent material into the oily water.

III.

On June 27, 1972, with an iridescent film and numerous
small patches of oil on the surface of West Waterway near

On June 27, 1972, with an iridescent film and numerous small patches of oil on the surface of West Waterway near the stern of the SIRIUS, appellant's employees used a dispersant chemical on the water surface until warned by respondent that this was unlawful. Respondent advised appellant on June 27, 1972 to remove and contain the oil.

IV.

On June 28, 1972, respondent contacted appellant several times relative to obtaining a boom to contain the oil which spill was in

FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS AND ORDER

evidence near the stern of the SIRIUS. Late that afternoon, after being warned by respondent that respondent would rent and install a boom and charge its costs to appellant, appellant called Marine Oil Pick-up Service, which installed a boom at 5:30 p.m. Appellant installed its own boom on June 29, 1972.

ν.

RCW 90.48.320 makes it unlawful for oil to enter waters of the state from a ship "regardless of the cause of entry." RCW 90.48.325 requires any person owning or controlling oil which is in violation of RCW 90.48. 320 "immediately (to) collect and remove" the oil; this section also empowers respondent to prohibit or restrict the uses of chemical RCW 90.48.350 authorizes respondent to levy a civil pentity dispersants. up to twenty thousand dollars for each intentional or negligent discharge of oil.

VI.

Appellant did not notify an appropriate state agency of the oil escaping from the stern of the SIRIUS on June 26, 1972.

VII.

On September 18, 1972 respondent, in its Docket No. DE 72-155, found that appellant was in violation of Chapter 90.48 RCW and assessed a civi penalty of five hundred dollars in connection therewith. That penalty i the subject of this appeal.

From these Findings of Fact, the Pollution Control Hearings Board comes to these

· · 25

26

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

 $\mathbf{I}\mathbf{1}$

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

FINDINGS OF FACT, 27

CONCLUSIONS

I.

Appellant was in violation of Chapter 90.48 RCW in that it (a) permitted oil to escape into waters of this state from a ship under its control on June 26, 27 and 28, 1972; (b) did not notify the appropriate state agency of the escaping oil, and (c) did not immediately contain the oil.

II.

Appellant's failure to contain oil escaping from the SIRIUS for nearly three days in violation of its statutory duty to "immediately" contain the oil constitutes negligence, which permitted the continued entry of oil into the waters of the state for that time period.

III.

As to the reasonableness of the five hundred dollar civil penalty invoked in this matter, the importance of this "small" oil spill must be weighed. The public policy of this state (90.48.010 RCW) is to "insure the purity of all waters" not only for "public health and public enjoyment" but also for the "propagation and protection of wildlife, birds, game, fish and other aquatic life." Any oil spill violates that policy.

In view of this, the instant civil penalty is reasonable and proper.

Therefore, the Pollution Control Hearings Board makes this

ORDER

The appeal is denied, and appellant is directed to pay to respondent the total civil penalty of five hundred dollars invoked under Docket No. DE 72-155.

FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS AND ORDER

_5

1	DONE	at	Olympia,	Washington	this 6th day of March, 1973.
2					POLLUTION CONTROL HEARINGS BOARD
3					Walt Hordward
4					WALT WOODWARD, Chairman
5					
6					W. A. GISSBERG, Member
7					Carot Start
8					JAMES T. SHEEHY, Member
9					
10					
11					
12					
13					
14					
15					
16					
17	-				
18					
19					
20					
21					
22					
23					
24					-
25					
26	ntuntuae o		T. O. T.		
27	FINDINGS C CONCLUSION	ır IS	FACT, AND ORDER	₹	6